

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is requested in view of the comments and amendments made herein.

Claims 1-7 and 9 remain rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Payzant (US 5,937,879). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. The claims have been amended herein to require that the coarse sieve, when in the second position, is raised above the flow of rinsing liquid such that the rinsing liquid cannot pass through the coarse sieve. This is supported on page 3, lines 23-30 and in Fig. 4. In contrast, when the filter of Payzant is raised, it is still positioned within the flow of the rinsing liquid. In fact, Payzant expressly states that “water must still pass through the perforations of either the screen or the filter ...” Further, in Col. 6, lines 44-49, Payzant states that water entering the opening 140 must pass through the perforations independently of the position of the filter. This is stated again at Col. 9, lines 27-35. Accordingly, Payzant fails to disclose that the filter - relied upon by the examiner as being equivalent to the claimed coarse sieve - is raising above the flow of rinsing liquid, and instead requires that the filter be in direct contact with such flow. Because Payzant does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in claims 1-7 and 9, Payzant cannot anticipate such claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payzant (US 5,937,879). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Claim 9 depends from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over Payzant for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payzant (US 5,937,879) in view of Taylor, Jr. et al. (US 5,660,195). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Claim 10 depends from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over Payzant for the reasons discussed above. Taylor, Jr. et al. does not make up for these deficiencies. Accordingly, claim 10 is believed to be allowable over the combination of Payzant and Taylor, Jr. et al. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/550,386
Amdt. dated March 12, 2010
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2010

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ABE-38790.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Una L. Laurica/
Una L. Laurica, Reg. No. 48998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: March 12, 2010